DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 445 702 JC 000 568

TITLE	Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges 1998-1999 Annual Report.
INSTITUTION	Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Santa Rosa, CA.
PUB DATE	1999-00-00
NOTE	23p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Accreditation (Institutions); Accrediting Agencies; Annual Reports; *Community Colleges; *Institutional Evaluation; *State Colleges; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	California

ABSTRACT

This paper presents the 1998-99 annual report for the California Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC). This report includes the following items: (1) message from Commission Chair Leon Baradat; (2) message from Executive Director David B. Wolf; (3) Commission Actions: Member Institutions, which lists actions taken January 1999 and June 1999, including such items as reaffirmed accreditation, continued accreditation, accepted midterm reports, unaccepted midterm reports, granted candidacy, imposed show cause order, accepted progress report with visit, placed on probation, accepted eligibility review, accepted substantive change request, substantive change report not accepted, and other actions; (4) summary of Commission Actions on Member Institutions: 1994-99 (as of June 1998); (5) Commission Actions: Policies, which looks at policy actions taken in 1998-99, including constitutional changes, public disclosures, policy and procedures for the evaluation of multi-college/multi-unit districts or systems, and Commission appointments made in June 1999; (6) staff activities: a summary, including campus visits, workshops and conferences, committee work, and publications; (7) team reports on comprehensive evaluations, by Judith Watkins, Associate Executive Director; (8) a report on ACCJC and institutional assessment, by Darlene Pacheco, Assistant Director; (9) ACCJC financial summary year ended June 30, 1999; and (10) a list of Commissioners and Staff members. (VWC)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 445 702

Annual Report
Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
1998-1999

CONTENTS

Message from Commission Chair Leon Baradat

Message from Executive Director David B. Wolf

Commission Actions: Member Institutions

Summary of Commission Actions on Member Institutions

Commission Actions: Policy

Staff Activities: A Summary

Team Reports on Comprehensive Evaluations

Judith Watkins, Associate Executive Director

ACCJC and Institutional Assessment

Darlene Pacheco, Assistant Director

Budget Summary

Commission and Staff

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
3402 Mendocino Avenue
Santa Rosa, CA 95403
Telephone: 707-569-9177
FAX: 707-569-9179
accjc@aol.com

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. C. Pearson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

IC000565

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A MESSAGE FROM COMMISSION CHAIR LEON BARADAT

The recently ended academic year was a full one for the Commission. Besides our regular meetings in January and June, the Commission met at Santa Rosa in March for a three-day retreat. In addition to deliberating and acting upon about one hundred reports and proposals at these meetings, the Commission developed significant positions on several issues critical to accreditation. Most notably, the Commission's policies on multi-college districts and on public disclosure were adopted at the June 1999 meeting after review by the field. The Commission also adopted the final modifications to its policies required by the US Department of Education in support of the Commission's petition for recognition.

Consultation, and perhaps coordination, of our efforts with those of the other accrediting bodies in WASC, and indeed among the accrediting bodies of the other regions in the country, has assumed new significance. The emergence of the University of Phoenix, Western Governors' University, U.S. Open University, and other such organizations that offer degrees over broad geographical areas, has stimulated a new interest in trans-regional accreditation. Representatives of the Commission and its staff have participated in these discussions at the regional, national, and international levels.

Under the leadership of Executive Director, David Wolf, the Commission has fostered a movement advocating improved training for current and potential leaders among the faculty and administrative personnel in community colleges. The vanguard of this movement has organized itself into the Community College Leadership Development Initiative (CCLDI). Its membership is comprised of an array of distinguished community college leaders from the ranks of faculty, administrators, and trustees. Currently, the CCLDI is discussing with several California universities the possibility of their offering appropriate leadership training programs.

The coming academic year also promises a full agenda. The Commission is looking forward to becoming better acquainted with its member colleges in the Pacific. To that end, its January 2000 meeting will be held in Guam. Besides a full compliment of reviews and reports to study and act upon next year, the Commission's time and attention will turn to need for beginning the process of modifying the accreditation standards and developing policy statements on distance learning. Although these items will not be completed next year, we must begin the process now
Like the member colleges whose accreditation status is reviewed each six years, the Commission's performance is reviewed at the same interval. This is usually done through a self-evaluation process and an extensive review executed by a committee external to the Commission. Again, in order to successfully execute these processes in the 2000-2001 academic year, we must begin planning and organizing in the current academic year.

I would like to end this report by writing a note of adieu to 3 persons who have departed the Commission. Faculty member Sally Flotho left the Commission due to retirement. Donna Durno, who represented the private colleges on the Commission, left the Commission to assume an important position in educational leadership in Pennsylvania. We thank both for their commitment and service to accreditation. Special thanks go to Constance Carol. Constance

served on the Commission for nine highly productive years. Indeed, Constance spent two years as the Commission's Chair. Constance distinguished herself by an encyclopedic knowledge of Commission policy, an indefatigable insistence that we apply rigorous standards of quality, and unfailing wisdom and good judgment. Her contributions to accreditation are truly extraordinary.

Sadness at the departure of these three fine people is somewhat mitigated by anticipation for their replacements: English professor and former Faculty Association of California Community Colleges president, Jane Hallinger; Tom McFadden, President of Marymont College; and College of the Siskiyous President, Martha Romero. The Commission welcomes these new members and looks forward to their contributions to our common enterprise.

A MESSAGE FROM EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR DAVID B. WOLF

The year just ended was a clarifying one. Over its course, a number of trends that are important to accreditation were further confirmed, and many Commission initiatives evolved significantly. Of central importance, 17 comprehensive institutional reviews were conducted, including one which resulted in candidacy for a new institution.This is the second year that employed the "new" accreditation standards contained in the 1996 Handbook of Accreditation, with increased emphasis on institutional effectiveness and student learning outcomes. In general there is some evidence that colleges are improving capacities to collect data on these matters, though the systems that would use this information to guide improvements in institutional performance are less developed.

Mt. San Antonio College undertook a special comprehensive review in Fall, 1998, one that employed both ACCJC Standards and Baldrige Criteria. All parties learned a great deal. The project also signaled an interest in alternative quality improvement systems. This interest has appeared in a number of important cases around the country. The Commission encourages institutions in good standing to consider an alternative review model that might be particularly appropriate.

Twenty-one follow-up visits were conducted during the year. Similarly, the number of Substantive Change Reports received by the Commission continues to increase slowly. The wide range of initiatives prompting these reports is significant-from changes in mission, to programs for foreign nationals overseas, to new branch campuses. Two Eligibility Reports were acted upon, an index of colleges that may be seeking initial accreditation in the future (noteworthy too is the number of campus centers that are planning to become separately accredited colleges). The energies of Commission staff continue to be significantly devoted to communication with member institutions. Newsletters have been expanded and the web-site has been broadened and kept current. Most important, staff members visited 47 different member locations. While there were many motivations for these visits, the most common (15) concerned preparations for self study. The staff was also active as presenters on accreditation issues at 32 regional and national conferences.

The Policy Committee forwarded a number of important recommendations to the Commission during the year. Salient among them was the creation of a Policy on Public Disclosure and a Policy for the Evaluation of Institutions in Multi-College/Multi-Unit Districts or Systems. The former clarifies the role of the Commission and institutions in providing information about various aspects of accreditation. The latter introduces new means to better integrate central offices into self study, team visit and other accreditation processes.

With the creation of the Council of Regional Accrediting Commissions (composed of all of the regional higher education commissions) the discussion of cross-regional issues has intensified. In 1998/99 draft procedures were developed to guide the accreditation of institutions that operate in more than one region. The Inter-Regional Accrediting Committee, created to work with the Western Governors University, continued to develop an alternative means of accrediting an institution that involves many regions. The various ways in which distance education

technologies are being employed by institutions will require new approaches by accreditors, and some of these will require increased cross-regional communication, cooperation, and perhaps coordination.

Telecommunications technology continues to impact Commission operations. We have begun to request and receive reports from colleges and team chairs in both hard copy and digital form, with the ultimate objective of using electronic means to meet long term information storage requirements.

Even as the ACCJC has made adjustments to comply with existing US Department of Education regulation, the most recent amendments to the Higher Education Act were signed into law and the process of developing new regulations is just about complete. The new regulations are likely to contain some technical improvements for accrediting agencies, but accountability, especially for matters relating to student outcomes, continues to be a dominant theme.

Finally, we offer best wishes to Judith Watkins, our esteemed Associate Executive Director who leaves Commission service after 9 outstanding years. Her knowledge, fresh approaches, and motivating style will be missed throughout the region. At the same time we can be assured that these same attributes will be available to us in the fulfillment of her new duties at the Council for Higher Education Accreditation.

The year that has ended saw much of which we can be pleased. And a new year begins...

COMMISSION ACTIONS: MEMBER INSTITUTIONS
ACTIONS TAKEN JANUARY 1999

Reaffirmed Accreditation
Antelope Valley College
Mt. San Antonio College

Accreditation Continued
Irvine Valley College
Saddleback College

Accepted Midterm Reports
Diablo Valley College
Don Bosco Technical Institute
Grossmont College
Mendocino College
Mission College
Orange Coast College
Rio Hondo College
Salvation Army College for Officer Training
West Valley College

Midterm Report Not Accepted
El Camino College

Accepted Focused Midterm Report With Visit
Cerritos College
Lassen College
Los Medanos College
Northern Marianas College
Ohlone College
Palo Verde College
San Joaquin Delta College
TransPacific Hawaii College

Accepted Focused Midterm Report
Contra Costa College
Crafton Hills College
Cuyamaca College
Ventura College

Accepted Interim Report
Laney College

Accepted Progress Report With Visit
American Academy of Dramatic Arts West
Vista Community College

Accepted Progress Report
Cañada College
Los Angeles City College
Los Angeles Mission College
Palomar College

Placed on Probation
D-Q University

Accepted Eligibility Review
Community Christian College
Western Career College

Accepted Substantive Change Request
American Academy of Dramatic Arts West
Palo Verde College
San Bernardino Valley College
San Joaquin Valley College
Los Angeles County College of Nursing and Allied Health

ACTIONS TAKEN JUNE 1999

Reaffirmed Accreditation
College of A!ameda
College of Marin
College of the Desert
Compton Community College
Cypress College
Deep Springs College
D-Q University
Fashion Institute of Design and Merchandising
Fullerton College
Lassen College
Merced College
Monterey Peninsula College
Oxnard College
Victor Valley College
West Hills College

Granted Candidacy
MTI College of Business and Technology

Accepted Progress Report
TransPacific Hawaii College

Accepted Progress Report with Visit
American Academy of Dramatic Arts West
Irvine Valley College
Saddleback College

Accepted Midterm Report
El Camino College

Imposed Show Cause Order
San Francisco College of Mortuary Science

Placed on Probation
Vista Comunity College

Accepted Addendum to Annual Report
Ohlone College

Approved Substantive Change Report

Brooks College
College of the Desert
Fresno City College

Substantive Change Report Not Accepted
Rio Hondo College

Other Actions
The Commission placed two institutions on warning. This is a confidential action that requires the institution to make corrections within a time period set by the Commission. However, the policy on Public Disclosure has been revised such that, beginning with the January 2000 meeting, all Commission decisions regarding the accredited status of an institution will be made public, including both Deferral and Warning status.

SUMMARY OF COMMISSION ACTIONS
1994-99 through June 1998

Action	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99
Applicant	4 (denied)	1 (denied)	2	2 (denied)	0
Candidacy	0	0	0	0	1
Initial Accreditation	2	0	0	0	0
Reaffirm	9	5	8	7	3
Reaffirm with Report	4	7	7	10	4
Reaffirm with Report and Visit	12	10	4	5	7
Deferral[1]	3	1	0	0	0
Warning[1]	2	3	3	7	3
Probation[2]	3	6	5	2	2
Show Cause[2, 3]	0	0	0	2	2
Termination[2,3]	0	0	0	0	1
Withdrawal/ Closure/ Transfer	0	1	0	0	0
Substantive Change	4	9	6 (1 denied)	6	9 (3 denied)
Progress Reports[4]	17	8	9 (1 denied)	20 (1 denied)	10
Special Reports[5]				2	1

[1] Deferrals and Warnings are private negative actions followed by reports and visits.
[2] Public negative actions followed by reports and visits
[3] Public negative action subject to ACCJC and WASC appeal
[4] Follow-up resulting from prior Commission actions
[5] Follow-up on Commission action regarding multi-college systems

COMMISSION ACTIONS: POLICIES
Policy Actions Taken in 1998-1999

Constitutional Changes

The composition, duties, and responsibilities of the Commissioner Selection Committee was moved from the WASC Constitution to the Commission Bylaws and a member to be appointed by the Pacific Postsecondary Education Council, a council of community college leaders from the Pacific, was added. The action increased the committee size to seven and guaranteed representation by institutional members from the Pacific.

Public Disclosure

Revisions to the language in the Policy on Public Disclosure clarify the relationship between member institutions and the Commission regarding public statements about an institution's accredited status. Specifically the policy on Public Disclosure has been revised such that, beginning with the January 2000 meeting, all Commission decisions regarding the accredited status of an institution will be made public, including both Deferral and Warning status.

Policy and Procedures for the Evaluation of Multi-college/Multi-unit Districts or Systems

The Policy and Procedures for the Evaluation of Institutions in Multi-college/Multi-unit Districts or Systems is designed to address "the important relations between institutions and systems in accreditation matters and to clarify the Commission's expectations regarding the conduct and outcomes of institutional reviews." The policy confirms that the Commission accredits colleges, not districts or systems; addresses concerns about the equitable evaluation of all institutions regardless of the differences in organizational setting; provides for coordination among the institution(s), the district/system, the evaluation team(s), and the Commission; and speaks to concerns that the level of scrutiny for all important organizational functions and outcomes be the same for all types of institutions. The policy will be distributed to member institutions in the near future and will be implemented in academic year 2000-2001.

Commission Appointments made in June 1999

Three new members were appointed to Commission membership. These appointments include Ms. Jane S. Hallinger, Associate Professor at Pasadena City College where she has taught since 1978; Dr. Thomas M. McFadden, President of Marymount College, a coeducational college devoted solely to the liberal arts; and Dr. Martha G. Romero, President of College of the Siskiyous since 1992 . Ms. Hallinger began her term in June, filling a faculty vacancy. Dr. McFadden and Dr. Romero began their terms on July 1.

Reappointed for additional three-year terms were Ms. Wallace Albertson, a public member, and Professor Jack Hernandez of Bakersfield College.

Completing terms on the Commission was Dr. Constance Carroll, President of San Diego Mesa College. During her tenure on the Commission, Dr. Carroll served as chair. Dr. Donna Durno, formerly an academic officer with the Heald Colleges, resigned from the Commission.

STAFF ACTIVITIES

A Summary

Commission Workshops:

Date	Workshop	Location
9/15/98	Self Study	De Anza College
9/17/98	Self Study	Yuba College
9/18/98	Team Training	Solano Community College
9/24/98	Self Study	Los Angeles Harbor College
9/25/98	Team Training	Cerritos College
1/22/99	Team Training	Skyline College
1/29/99	Team Training	Long Beach City College
8/20/99	Team Chairs	SFO/Westin

Campus Visits:
Maintaining close contact with member institutions is a high Commission priority. Accordingly, staff routinely visited campuses. Thirty-five campuses were visited, including the Pacific campuses in Hawaii, American Samoa, Guam, the Northern Marianas, Micronesia, and the Marshall Islands. Several of the private institutions were also visited. Staff served on five interim evaluation teams, and visited six district offices. Eight special self study workshops, two eligibility reviews, and one Board of Trustees workshop were conducted.

Workshops and Conferences:
Staff participated in the activities of the higher education community by attending a variety of conferences, both state and regional, as well as international. Examples of these activities included attendance and presentations at conferences of the Association of Specialized and Professional Accreditors, the American Association of Community Colleges, the Distance Education and Training Council, the American Association of Higher Education, the Council for Higher Education Accreditation, the Community College League of California , the International Network for Quality Assurance Agencies in Higher Education, and the various associations of California community college system--the CEO's, the CIO's, the CBO's, the CSSO's, and the Human Resources Officers, as well as the Statewide Academic Senate. Staff assisted in the development of the Assessment Institutes and participated in them.

Committee Work:
As part of the commitment to providing leadership in the higher education accreditation community, staff developed and participated in a retreat for ACCJC Commissioners and served on committees and task forces of the other regional accreditors. Staff also served on committees and task forces of the Council for Higher Education Accreditation as well on interregional committees charged with developing policy. The advent of increased interregional cooperation has amplified the level for involvement of staff in policy development as well as in setting the national accreditation agenda.

Publications:
Staff published two articles, one in **Change** (July/Aug 1999, vol. 31, No. 4) and one in **Assessment and Accountability Forum** (Summer 1999, vol. 9, No. 2).

Team Reports on Comprehensive Evaluations
by
Judith Watkins, Associate Executive Director

In the 1998-1999 academic year, evaluation teams conducted 16 comprehensive visits. These visits represent the second round of comprehensive visits using the 1996 Handbook of Accreditation. The institutions evaluated covered the range of colleges that make up commission membership--a small private college serving twenty-six male students, a medium-sized college with a limited mission, small and medium-sized rural colleges, large urban colleges in both single and multi-college districts, and one college that used the Baldrige Criteria as a framework for its self study. One team conducted an initial institutional evaluation visit that resulted in the granting of candidacy. Many of the issues highlighted in last year's analysis of the 1997-98 reports are repeated as the concerns of this year's teams. The issues are reviewed in order of the frequency in which they occurred.

Institutional Planning and Research

In 15 of the 16 institutions receiving comprehensive visits for reaffirmation, teams cited institutional planning as the most serious and continuing problem. Teams found that, despite the fact that some planning is occurring, it is being done in a manner that does not integrate planning activities into the operations of the institution. As a result, systematic, comprehensive, and integrated plans are lacking and opportunities to identify priorities and to implement change go unidentified.

The "culture of evidence" encouraged by the Commission as being support for research and data analysis continues to elude many colleges. This notable lack of research continues to exacerbate the difficulty institutions are having with planning. Fifteen teams urged institutions to recognize the need for an effective research function which supports evaluation, planning and decision making. A paucity of data hampers institutional ability to create and move an agenda that will demonstrate the institutional effectiveness required in Standard Three. Teams did note that several institutions reported the intent to add research positions to their staffs.

Program Evaluation

Evidence for institutional planning supported by program evaluation that leads to improvement of programs and services continues to be lacking in many institutions. Twelve teams cited program review issues, noting that, even in institutions where some reviews are being done, analyses are frequently not included in the planning process in a way that supports meaningful decision making. In several instances, teams registered concern that a program review plan had been developed, but no reviews were being conducted. Other teams observed that not all facets of the institution are included in reviews of programs--student services, for example.

Governance

Governance and Administration issues continue to revolve around unresolved struggles about participation and communication. Several teams noted that lack of clearly-defined roles in institutional governance was creating an inability to meet the minimum of good practice in governance, and in some instances, leading to outright hostility.

Team findings regarding the Board noted failure to clarify the Board's role in governance and implementation of policies. This lack of clarity resulted in instances of trustees being perceived as lacking understanding of their duties and responsibilities, and in some cases led to team recommendations cautioning Boards of Trustees against interference with the day-to-day life of the college.

Diversity and Equity

Diversity and equity concerns continue to appear as issues in team evaluations. Most team recommendations related to lack of demonstrated institutional commitment to diversify faculty and other staff in recognition of Commission policy urging cognizance of the "significant education role played by persons of diverse ethnic, social, and economic backgrounds." Some teams addressed the lack of review of student services for diverse student populations, noting that institutions are not evaluating and up-dating programs addressing student equity issues. All in all, team recommendations, based on the Commission's policy on diversity, propose that institutions provide evidence that they are actively promoting diversity in the everyday environment and the academic programs of the college.

Finance

Several teams cited concerns about an array of financial issues, relating these concerns to lack of integrated planning. Teams note difficulty in resource allocation, annual and long-range planning, budget management, participatory processes in budget development, and financial stability. Teams report that institutions are not documenting how financial planning is tried to the programs and services of the college.

Mission Statements

Found in last year's team reports, this issue again emerged in several team evaluations. Standard 1 requires that the institution's mission statement be revised and evaluated on a regular basis. What some teams found was that mission statements had not been reviewed since the last accreditation visit or longer and that mission statements were not connected to planning.

Evaluation

As with last year's evaluators, this year's team members noted that evaluation of faculty and support staff continues to be problematic. The evaluation processes of several institutions did not result in evaluation of staff and faculty in a timely and systematic manner. In some instances, teams noted that evaluation did not include follow up with the individual being evaluated. Standard Seven requires that institutions provide all faculty and staff with a process for evaluating performance as well as the means for self improvement.

Team Recommendations and the 1996 Standards of Accreditation

Just as it is important to comment on the patterns of recommendations which were present in the team reports, it is equally important to examine what was not found in those reports and recommendations. Although the concepts of institutional outcomes and student learning outcomes were part of earlier iterations of the standards, the 1996 Handbook of Accreditation,

Guide to Self Study, and Evaluator Handbook all dealt with these subjects much more explicitly and with much greater expectations for both institutions and evaluation teams.

Examination of the team reports suggests that the performance of the teams was mixed. Standard 3C.1, "The institution specifies intended institutional outcomes and has clear documentation of their achievement," was discussed in 15 of the team reports, generating13 team recommendations, an increase of eight recommendations in this area over the previous year. The pattern for Standard 4B.3, "The institution identifies and makes public expected learning outcomes for its degree and certificate programs," was less encouraging. In this instance the standard was not discussed directly in 15 of the team reports. Teams will be asked to attend more closely to these two issues in future evaluation team reports.

Assessment and the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
by
Darlene Pacheco, Assistant Director

Over the past decade, concern about the quality of undergraduate education has given rise to a significant national movement of assessment of student outcomes and institutional effectiveness. This increased insistence on quality assurance and improvement has come from the federal government, state governors and legislatures, business leaders, students and their families, and, most importantly, higher education leaders themselves. Higher education accreditation leaders have recognized that this public concern compels institutions to document what its students are achieving--what they know and what they can do at the completion of a collegiate experience at the course, program, and degree levels.

The fundamental purpose of assessment is to examine and enhance an institution's effectiveness, not only in terms of teaching and learning, which rests at the heart of the mission of a college, but also the effectiveness of the institution as a whole. It is, in short, not an end in itself, but a means for promoting educational improvement. Accreditors are expected to obtain from member institutions evidence that student learning is being assessed and that the results of assessment are being utilized to improve the learning/teaching process.

While many colleges have been quick to respond to the call for a greater focus on outcomes, some colleges are struggling to develop processes supportive of research and data analysis that demonstrate the "broad-based and integrated system of research, evaluation and planning" urged in the Standard Three.

Since Commission standards require that the institution specify its intended outcomes and document achievement of them, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges has helped provide assistance to institutions working on the student outcomes and institutional effectiveness assessment, while not prescribing any particular methodology for its achievement.

In the 1997-1998 academic year, ACCJC co-sponsored two intensive three-day assessment workshops conducted by staff of the National Center for Postsecondary Teaching, Learning, and Assessment of the Pennsylvania State University. Co-sponsors for these events included the California Community College Chancellor's Office, the Community Colleges of Hawaii, the Research and Planning Group (an association of researchers in the California Community Colleges), and two colleges--Santa Ana College and Napa Valley College. Member institutions were invited to send campus teams to these workshops, facilitating work on the development of an institutional assessment agenda.

Attendees at these workshops heard from experts in the assessment field and attended sessions on such topics as assessment of student learning in general education, vocational education, and basic skills; assessment strategies and methods; how to develop an assessment plan; and accreditation issues in assessment.

Evaluations of these initial offerings and reports from the field prompted a number of changes and in Fall 1998 the ACCJC, the RP Group, and the California Community College Chancellor's Office organized and presented an institute. It was hosted by Hartnell College. This institute featured keynote addresses by recognized national educational leaders with breakout sessions conducted by assessment experts from within the state. Attendees numbered over 170 individuals who represented over 60 institutions.

Hosted by College of the Desert, another institute was held in Spring 1999 in Palm Springs. In excess of 175 individuals attended. Their evaluations suggested that bringing teams comprised of campus leaders (as opposed to sending a single individual) to the institute was an effective way to begin the development of an institutional assessment program.

The institutes held to date have featured keynote addresses from well-known national leaders in higher education such as Peter Ewell from the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems and have focused on general questions and issues concerning assessment. The addresses have set the stage for breakout sessions dealing with the practical aspects of developing evidence-based programs of institutional assessment.

The breakout sessions have featured experts leading discussions on specific topics, including assessment of student learning; accreditation standards and assessment; assessment of basic skills and general and vocational education; program review; student equity/success; surveying campus climate; using tests in assessment; and how to present assessment information. As examples of the specific topics covered, the session on assessment of student learning reviewed types of indicators of student outcomes such as: capstone experiences, portfolios, performance measures, transcript analysis, anecdotal records, focus groups, standardized tests, and indicators that provide indirect evidence of student learning such as retention and transfer data.

The session on accreditation standards and assessment focused on how outcomes serve as benchmarks for the college mission by comparing institutional achievement with institutional objectives. Each of the current standards was reviewed for how institutional effectiveness can be demonstrated.

The sessions on assessment and basic skills and vocational and general education dealt with strategies for assessing such matters as cognitive skills, problem solving, content literacy, competence in information management, skills in communication, and value awareness (e.g. cultural awareness).

The timing and delivery of sessions permitted team members to attend most sessions of interest. These were designed to address the issues of institutions at various stages of development in their assessment practices. This pattern will continue to be the structure for future institutes, though new topics and new emphases will emerge as planners are provided with suggestions for improvement.

The success of the 1998-1999 institutes prompted a small task force representing the sponsors to write a grant proposal seeking funding from the Chancellor's office for additional institutes for the 1998-99 academic year. Having received the grant, the group now has plans underway for institutes to be held in the 1999-2000 academic year. The Fall 1999 institute will be hosted by Long Beach City College in Long Beach, California. The Spring 2000 institute will be hosted by Cabrillo College in Monterey, California.

ACCREDITING COMMISSION FOR COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES
FINANCIAL SUMMARY*

YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1999

REVENUES, 1998-1999	
Annual Fees	$801,108
Evaluation Service Charges	
Comprehensive Visits	$94,562
Actual Cost Visits	$4,107
Interim Visits	$11,753
Investment Income including unrealized gains	$38,960
Contributed Services	$190,000
Other Income	$643
TOTAL REVENUES	$1,141,133
EXPENSES	
Personnel	$469,211
Office	$107,754
Meetings/Travel/Workshops/Dues	$148,188
Evaluation Visits	$108,229
Contributed Services	$190,000
TOTAL EXPENSES	$1,023,382

*Based on independent audit

COMMISSIONERS

Leon Baradat
Chairperson
MiraCosta College
George Boggs
Vice Chairperson
Palomar College
Wallace Albertson
Public Member
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala
Public Member
Barbara Beno
Vista Community College
Constance M. Carroll
San Diego Mesa College
John T. Cruz
Guam Community College
Donna Durno
Heald Colleges
Judith Endeman
Schools Commission
Margaret Hartman
CSU, Los Angeles
Jane Hallinger
Pasadena City College
Jack Hernandez
Bakersfield College
Celina Sau Lin Ing
Sacramento City College
Lucy L. Killea
Public Member
Lee M. Lockhart
Public Member
Garman "Jack" Pond
Leeward Community College
Joseph L. Richey
Public Member
Joyce Tsunoda
Community Colleges
University of Hawaii
Judy E. Walters
Chancellor's Office of the
California Community Colleges

STAFF

David B. Wolf
Executive Director

Judith Watkins
Associate Executive
Director
A. Darlene Pacheco
Assistant Director
Barbara Dunham
Administrative Assistant
Tom Lane
Administrative Support